

**PROPOSED BROADWAY TRAILHEAD PROJECT MEETING
TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 25, 2001
LEW SORENSEN CENTER, 6:30 P.M.**

MEETING PURPOSE

To exchange information among trail users, neighbors, the National Park Service, Bureau of Land Management, and Pima County Natural Resources, and Parks and Recreation Department staff regarding proposed Broadway Trailhead design elements.

AGENDA

5 min Introductions/Background
60 min Design proposal review
15 min Small group report out
10 min Problems of existing conditions
10 min Sheriff's presentation
15 min Location/site discussion review
5 min Future meetings schedule

INTRODUCTIONS of planning team and other staff from NPS, BLM, and Pima County: Meg Weesner, Bob Lineback, Tom Danton, , Jim Bellamy, Cate Bradley, Francisco Mendoza, Lorraine Buck, Tony Herrell, Rafael Payan, and Susan Early.

PROJECT OVERVIEW

This is the 5th session of the Broadway Trailhead scoping meetings.

CB: I will recap where we have been very quickly:

>On 6/14 the BLM list of issues was presented.

>The 2nd meeting was to discuss how a large group of people who don't know each other would work together. Ground rules were developed by the group.

>During the 3rd meeting we got a little waylaid by the question and answer comment period – many were repeated issues from the 1st meeting.

>The 4th meeting looked at 9 location sites under consideration and got some comments from you, and agency staffs explained how they assessed those locations with the pro and cons.

Tonight we will have the audience and planning team get input on what are the design criteria that need to be considered for each of these proposals, approximately 1 hour. Then we will take 15 minutes each on what the small groups commented on.

Jim Bellamy and Bob Lineback will talk about problems that have triggered this need to assess the project. A representative from the Sheriff's Office will speak so we can learn about the SO's experience in the Broadway and Speedway areas from their perspective.

We will review the location of sites from the last meeting.

And lastly, we will decide on a date for the next meeting.

Comment from the audience – I notice we have the Sheriff here. We can't do the design until we know why we are doing this, when, where, etc. We say we can't do this even though we went out and measured everything, but we decided we can't do this until we know who we are doing this for. We haven't had a cogent, viable, honest answer about why we are doing this. A petition was done but arrived on 9/10 that was too late to do anything – the petition is a statement of concern about this process. We presented a list of 10 questions to Secretary Norton about horses, design, and security. We can't do this in any kind of meaningful way. We can go through process in a pro forma manner. We are very frustrated and would like to stop this process until we get some clear answers. The major question is why? I, and several others, are unwilling to participate in design until the why is answered.

CB – Could I preface this with that I hear the frustration and there have been people getting through the nuts and bolts of this process. I believe we need to really do this tonight since we have been trying since June.

We can't do this.

CB – this can be done in 20 minutes now so that people who have been coming to this meeting can do this process. Can there be a show of hands that our commitment is to get at reviewing these designs as we have promised?

JB – are there people here who want to look at design criteria? [There were some hands raised.]

CB - I would like to try to bring us back to where we have been and where we have come. The NPS and BLM have addressed all the concerns that you have brought up, and it has brought the agencies together to address those concerns in this area. Whether you accept those as concerns or not, it is not my position to go into this, but those are the fundamental issues that brought the planning team together to address this project.

What as resource managers is not clear is why they are moving forward with this process.

JB – I suggest we go forward with this process. There is some agreement from the group that we move through the agenda that was agreed upon on June 14. Unless we agree on an agenda and keep with the timeframes, we will still be here next January.

I would like to leave room for – the group may not be satisfied – not brand new – and time for why, what, etc., but I have other questions before we design this process. I have a feeling that the design is getting pretty close to end of the public process and I still don't think we have the rationale for this process. I am concerned about getting back to the agenda when we have a roomful of people with questions. I suggest a compromise to hear the presentations, but please do not ask us to commit to going further until you convince us to go further.

JB - we will do the presentations, but I think we ought to let people who are here to work on the designs do so and we could let the others leave.

No, you are missing my point –

JB - the NEPA process requires us to get public input – we are going far beyond the NEPA requirements in going this long.

When are you going to listen to the majority of people here who don't think you need the project at all?

CB - do we have an agreement to go ahead with the problem identifications and proposals and information? Do some want to go ahead and work on the design? Yes.

JB & BL – existing conditions:

Why build? What are the problems? The following items are driving the need for the project:

1. Unsafe parking/reduce liability – the public is in an unsafe situation with roadside parking to the extent that riders and pedestrians are in the roadway in the situation of a 40 mph speed limit. We are supposed to have forgiving shoulders on all roadways.

2. Illegal activities

shooting, nighttime parties, at end of Broadway mostly

roadway end or trailhead expansion shows that most of this problem goes away

An incident sheet was passed out –

BL – this is based on the summary given out previously. It is broken out by year, date, and incident and is only NPS statistics.

What about the horse accident on 9/19/00 that was 1 ½ mile inside the park?

BL – I agree that should not be in there – the computer system picks up all incidents reported. The number one problem is unsafe parking and we don't keep records of that. We can go down there and observe.

Would there be locked areas where people would not be able to trailer in at dawn, for example?

BL - A gate could be electronically operated. It could have a timer and could be set an hour before dawn, for example.

Would there be increased patrols there? BL - we hope so, dependent on funding and staffing.

To continue with the existing conditions:

3. Establish a reasonable use capacity for the area – this ties in with the management of the park, the management of the wilderness area of the park. It would be wise to establish limits at this time instead of trying to do it in future.

4. Alleviate private property/driveway conflicts

5. Implement approved plans - already approved plans such as the General Management Plan for Saguaro National Park and the trails plan for Pima County.

JB – at a lot of the meetings, a lot of people have expressed an objection to a parking lot. Written comments received seem to favor a parking lot or favor a lot with qualifications.

There is not a clear majority there; lots of people (40%) favor something – most importantly ...

JB – we hope to have a written analysis (that we contracted out) of those comments soon.

With all due respect, the users are not just the people who live next to the park, but everyone is able to use the park – we'd like to get down to having some parking for us. I think the park is doing a heck of a job. There is no project that the government has done where neighbors aren't opposed. We need to get on with this.

If trailers come and the parking lot is full, then people won't turn around, and then they will park along the road as always. There haven't been incidents.

JB – yes, there have been incidents. We have heard from the equestrians, and we agree that we need more horse spaces.

Then I think you need to get more parking spaces somewhere else than the end of Broadway in a place where you can turn around.

Pima County – that's why design elements are important.

JB – we have been hearing what the group has been saying in that regard. I think we can use the design to develop those elements.

I have been involved with horse shows and staging areas – the people who have been involved – none of your plans meet the horse demands if they are going to have the horses in there. We have to have horses where they are separate and secure.

JB – that's why we wanted to hear from you on design. We agree that we are trying to reduce the conflicts between horses and vehicles or people. To the extent we can do this, we want to design these factors in.

This points out why we need to know why we are doing this. If we are going to limit horses, then a parking lot won't do that – how about permit systems, etc.? If that is one of the whys, then we need to discuss that.

JB – there are a number of ways to limit this. In that area, there is a maximum number of use size for hikers and for horses also. To manage in a cost-effective way – parking lots are a light touch way to limit use. You are right there are other ways to manage – they may go other places or park along the road. And of course, what we are proposing (the initial proposal) was to restrict parking along the roadway on the west side at least. Issuing permits is a fairly expensive way to manage use.

We can't address design or location until we know what the numbers are.

BL - we wanted to ask the group what they thought was a reasonable number – that's why we are getting to the design process.

Is part of the aim of all of this that the park feels there are too many horses in the park and are trying to limit horses in park? If that is the case, then we need to know that.

JB - we are not trying to do that. We are seeing that we need to increase the spaces. We are trying to accommodate current use and some increased use, but we will get to the time when we need to limit use.

I have seen 25-30 trailers out there. Why isn't there a design for current use – is there an option of having 30-40 spaces out there?

JB – what we are prepared to do in a revised design is 12 to 15; we feel that this will catch most of the days but not the 30 you mention. We are hearing that spaces need to be wider and longer, and we don't want to get too huge a parking lot, so we have to reduce spaces.

Why are you just making Broadway Trailhead when you have so much space farther down Broadway to use?

JB – we are considering other locations. At the time we made the Environmental Assessment (EA) proposals, we felt the end of Broadway caused less impact on existing resources; we would use the impacted footprint. We are considering other sites that have been suggested as part of this process. Locations that deal with the existing trailhead - we would have to mitigate existing vegetative impacts due to Fish and Wildlife regulations. A new trail (somewhere else) would have to be longer which would impact hikers even though that wouldn't matter much to equestrians. It is intended that the abandoned Wentworth roadway is used for county trail systems.

The new [park] helipad – you'll use this [in this area]?

JB - No, the park helipad is up at park headquarters about 5 miles away.

2 questions - if you are saying we should use the end of Broadway – separate horses – why couldn't we have pedestrians at Broadway and put equestrians somewhere along Freeman between Broadway and Old Spanish Trail?

JB – concern is with impact in two places and on park resources as well as the cost. Also, we thought leaving it at the end would keep it further from homes. If we go further west and south we will be closer to other neighbors.

The neighborhood sees the problem that Freeman and Broadway are paved and have a concern of [users] entering unpaved neighborhood roads.

JB - the trailhead information will describe the approach to areas on paved roads.

This paper lists problems that are really crimes – law enforcement problems. The cost of a parking lot versus the cost of a security patrol – maybe it is a question of increasing patrols in those areas (such as illegal parking along the road). The concern about NPS land usage – I don't see that – it should be on park land.

JB – the park boundary lies in the middle of Broadway and belongs to the park south of there. There is a right of way issued to the county, and we cooperate on jurisdiction .

Why not put it all onto the park land – better addressing this issue of crime or Sheriff's Department putting more patrolling out there?

JB - "safe by design" is to be discussed at the next meeting. Designing facilities properly prevents safety issues later. We can have the best intentions to increase patrols, but the staff is stretched thin. We would prefer to design with safety in mind.

I'm disappointed you didn't read the email I sent you. The deed you have from 1973 says that the park boundary ends 40 feet of south of the marker

JB - I read your email. In your email you also said that the NPS bought that property.

You haven't answered the question.

JB – I will get our lands people to answer that question – we thought we owned that land. We will get an answer.

RP – if the road is only a roadway, then parking is illegal along it, and that's why a parking lot on Federal property would be needed, and I believe all the designs are on federal property.

Rudy Shaft from Pima County Sheriff's Office – I have passed out statistics from the Sheriff's Office. I compiled the same list that the Park Service did as far as crime statistics, and I don't know if that is what you wanted. If I am here at future meetings, then I will get what information you wish. I'm not here to review the parking lot issue, but if you have any questions on the area...

Do you consider it to be a high crime area? RS - no

Does it need extra patrols?

RS - in the future, no – now, no. When I was told that I was going to come here to do this presentation, I thought you would want to know what the area statistics were.

Do you consider Freeman a road in its present condition a place where (Broadway and Speedway) we want to bring more traffic, visitors, etc.? RS - no, not much more.

This brings back the issue of bringing more people there, especially people pulling trailers. We need to look at bigger issues of why we are bringing people there.

RS - I see a conflict in the group with people wanting parking forever and your view of not wanting to bring more people.

I want to take a look at the parameters and the effect of whatever we are doing before we consider doing it. A related question of safety is why we need to do more talking about what we are doing.

Would you say from a law enforcement position that this is not a high crime area and that the parking problems are not a big issue?

RS - I don't see a parking problem yet, and we don't have much report of crime.

If facilities were to be built at the end of Broadway, would you more than likely see an increase in problems?

RS - if it is going to be a big parking lot with a lot of people, then yes, you will probably have more problems. The Sheriff's Office is short-handed and would probably not be doing much more for that area. We have two deputies to patrol the eastside that (Beat 2) has been sufficient up to now. It is a fact of life that the Sheriff's Office and the Tucson Police Department need more officers with the growing community. The end of Speedway, we work in conjunction with the NPS – we help each other. The biggest problem is drug usage – we don't have murders and not a lot of stolen vehicles though some recovered vehicles are there. We might have more larcenies with more vehicles, but it probably won't become a high crime area. The Sheriff's Office likes to work on the eastside because it is not a high crime area, but we will do the job if it is there. The Sheriff's Office will be prepared to take care of problems if the area is built. We could ticket a lot more people, but we don't win a lot of those. We will get illegal parkers and curfew violations. I looked at past issues – the NPS will handle signs (JB - with the county and BLM) – and safety issues if the parking lot goes in. Lights (locked at sundown?), closing and opening times – are enforced and will be by all agencies.

Freeman Road is very dangerous. We ride horses other ways to the park. It makes sense if we have to pay \$5 to get in the main gate, but if it is free on Broadway, Speedway, and Freeman, then people will go there. Is there a concern about bringing more cars there?

Jeff Weatherford – Pima County Department of Transportation – we are looking at big guide signs directing people down Freeman. We want to change to direct people only from Houghton. We are looking at putting in greater shoulders there – getting property rights, funding etc. – this is coming, but I don't know when.

Lighting – comment – do we need lights at night? RS - yes, it helps. Would those be on? When? RS - that is an NPS issue. JB - yes, we would want lights for evening parking for sure, but neighbors would not want it.

RS - the parking lot at the end of Campbell is signed but not gated.

We have a concern that parties may be pushed into neighborhoods.

RS – I think that they would leave because the parties would fear that they would be called on to law enforcement. We do patrol out there so I don't think that it would get worse even if the parking lot is built. We used the map from Freeman Road east and from Broadway just past Speedway to give an idea of what was going on – we can go back further in time if the group wants it.

The original proposal called for a parking lot using the end of Broadway and about 150 yards or so back to the west, closing at night and making sure no parking on the road was enforced back to Freeman. Wouldn't you suspect people would park on Codorniz or other dirt roads instead? That was our concern for safety. Would you expect that to happen?

RS – yes. We would have to go out there and check on that – that is the Sheriff's Office's job to check those vehicles – checking people's welfare, if a vehicle is stolen or abandoned, etc. Does that answer the question?

It raises the question - what is the likely impact on dirt roads in the Notch area if you close off access on Broadway – would we have to close the dirt roads?

RS – it is the spirit of the law and the letter of the law. We are not going to ticket everybody for illegal parking. We will tow vehicles that are across driveways. Partying goes on the dirt streets – lots of beer cans. Open facilities will draw more people. Concerned about guide signs.

JW – we can only guide people, but we will not be able to restrict use of other users on a public roadway, even on the dirt roads.

Who is going to be liable when there is a crime of opportunity on those dirt roads – burglaries, etc.?

RS – you must be calling us.

We are bringing a high density parking lot into a rural neighborhood.

I'd like to say that the city is growing, and we can't shut it off (access to the park).

I have a concern about planning a parking lot back there and cutting off drainage from flooding .

CB – you are getting into design comments now. Any more questions for the Deputy?

RS - I made copies of actual parking statutes for your information.

On #5, nobody has really spoken to the issue of a parking lot at the corner of Wentworth and Broadway. What is the necessity of Pima County to have a parking lot at that point?

RP – we are looking at different sites. It is not important to necessarily be there. There is no site selected yet. We need to decide the site first [audience]. I'm a landscape architect. We need to establish design capacities for this project and carrying capacities first before can decide which site will work. In the past, x number of horse trailers and users, cars for hikers, etc. – this was done so we could decide what was needed in the site. We need to establish the parameters and what is reasonable, then we can look at various sites and decide the parameters of the sites.

What is the reasonableness of having horses and cars in same place?

RP – we have considered separating them or putting them together.

Can you do that?

RP - Yes, we can do anything.

What are the properties of the property itself? I am concerned about considering a design without looking at sites first.

RP – if we had all the property in the world and resources issues were not important, then we could consider anything. We have not been listening to the NPS well because they keep saying their criteria is to minimize the impact to the site of the envelope for that parking lot, and as well down the road minimize or limit the horse trailers that are using the sites. What can we do to marry all these criteria together to design a site?

Now the land is half BLM and NPS – old roadway.

RP – if it is disturbed land, if we have ownership, then we want to use this land first before disturbing other land [e.g., Wentworth].

BL – the county abandoned the road right of way [Wentworth] and retained a trail right of way that is still available for uses such as we are talking about.

Is it fenced off? BL – it is available.

RP – I am as concerned as everyone here even though I don't live in this area. We need to establish targets.

We have stated several times that the Broadway road does not lend itself to a parking area. What is going to stop it from backing up into the intersection, and what is to stop people from parking in neighborhoods?

RP - Signing can help. If we can come up with a parking lot somewhere and no parking on the roadway or within the neighborhood [permitting only] – it can be done. The concern about bringing more people in – failing to control it will not stop people from coming in. Short of coming up with a solution, and a parking lot can be a solution if controlled (e.g., tire rippers). You are going to have more people coming anyway. You are going to have all these problems. What kind of design criteria can we design to limit access, liability, etc.? Failure to respond to a problem (we have had meetings about why didn't we solve problems that we have identified) - what can we do to select design criteria and sites that we can marry together that we have identified weeks ago? Keeping the process going is not a solution – what are you going to do 5 years from now when the people and traffic are spilling into your neighborhood anyway?

What is the problem, and what do you want to do about it?

RP – we will have the problem eventually, and the 3 agencies will eventually be in a lawsuit because we didn't deal with an identified problem. What can we do about illegalities? Sign, enforce.

Could we fix Freeman Road first? Why not do this first – egress, ingress, and related roadways first?

RP – here is one of the challenges we have. The Department of Transportation is different than NPS and BLM, in that monies we have acquired are specific for this project. If there were a master plan for trails and trailheads around the county – my obligation is to listen to you – but the fact is my obligation to the county is that there is a master plan to establish trails as the NPS has a General Management Plan to have a trailhead at Broadway. We also have committed to this project for heritage funding. My obligation is to follow through on this.

The county has taken bond funds from 22nd street and put it somewhere else. They can do anything they want with money.

Since I started this tonight, I would like to thank the people who came here to give us some information because this discussion has gotten us closer to establishing parameters and to recognizing the parameters that we establish can affect the design. It has helped me understand more what we are looking at for this project. We have a general idea of what we are trying to do. This was useful and I thank you for giving us this time. The petition of 10 questions we submitted I would like to enter into the minutes of this meeting so we can give due consideration of them and would like to respond to the concern that we are trying to stop this process. We want anything done, to be done well, as we will be living there for a long time. If we seem very obsessed it is because we want it to be done really, really well, and how it affects us, and how it affects the long-range development of the park. We want to look at it in context with other trail projects. It is my personal feeling that exploring these questions/issues will help us to understand the context.

CB – please read the 10 questions so everyone will understand what you are talking about.

(Comments given during the reading of the questions were not captured because recorder did not have list to refer to and couldn't separate questions from comments.) The questions received subsequently are as follows:

1. What are the specific goals of the National Park Service in building this facility?
2. What specific perceived problems is the National Park Service trying to solve and what data does the Park Service have indicating that this facility will provide a solution to those problems?
3. What studies have been done and made available to concerned citizens to determine the impact of the project on the following: Clean Air Act, Clean Water Act, Endangered Species Act, Archeological Site Preservation, Buffer Overlay Zone, implementation of Sonoran Desert Conservation Plan, use of BLM facility as part of total impact of use in trailhead area, arterial and neighborhood roads and residential neighbors, additional facility use as it changes nature of use at this trailhead.

4. What perceived problems or situations exist at this time and at this location requiring the project to occur at Broadway rather than other trailheads around the park?
5. What is the ten year plan for this facility in terms of who will be the managing body (County, BLM, or Park Service), making decisions concerning rules, expansion, etc.? Will there be a change in status enabling future development without notice to concerned stakeholders?
6. Does the NPS plan to reapply for Heritage Funds or comparable financial assistance to further expand facilities and increase traffic in this area?
7. What is the ten-year plan for this facility in terms of its relationship to other facilities in and around the park, and future development or additional facilities in the area of the Broadway Trailhead?
8. Does an agreement exist between Pima County, the National Park Service and BLM in a land trade or joint operation concerning this project? Is an agreement in existence exchanging the parking lot at end of Broadway for a gate to be installed at that location?
9. What are the crime problems (in detail) at this site, how do they differ from the alternative sites and from other trailheads, and elsewhere in the county at other "out of sight" locations (washes, dead end roads, etc.)?
10. Do engineering studies exist to address some of the perceived problems of mixed user use of the proposed parking lot, and have comparable studies been done on comparable sites to indicate that Broadway is the best site?

Reader of questions feels we can't do any designing without answers to these questions.

These questions address quality of life issues and address an area that is so pristine. Other people are telling us that we have to accept that there is going to be increased crime, increased safety issues, increased people, etc. It is [important] to a lot of us because [of] a net plus or net minus, and we are only building this with money we don't have now – what is the point of building this?

Who are you to deny the rest of the populace access to this park area?

RP – if we are putting in a lot, taking out other lots and parking areas, we could actually accommodate more people and could actually improve the quality of life. We need to do everything possible to make it better. We need to balance use, properly place the lot, reinforce no parking, eliminate uncontrolled parking. Failure means you are probably going to get a lot more parking in the future. Eliminate liability, control where parking goes, make area better.

You can do what you want, stop parking on the road, if you really want to expedite this. If you are willing to do that, you can move quickly on designing something in an enclosed fixed space in the national park and not in the neighborhood.

CB – your questions begin to address why that is not a simple solution - [with the] discussion questions you begin to hear some of the complexities that the NPS deals with such as resource protection.

We want questions to be answered by authorities and the group is not to be able to answer those – sharing our feelings doesn't really matter – we need people in authority to make decisions.

I'd like to make a comment. I have been coming to most of these meetings. I'm a Notch area homeowner but I don't necessarily agree in that I think change is going to take place and I agree with addressing the whys and doing it in the very best way possible. Am I wrong that our input is simply that – input – you are going to do what you want to do? I think we need to move past us controlling this so that it benefits not just the Notch area but will do for everybody using this area.

JB – we are going to make decisions on your input and a large number of other parameters. We have that responsibility and we are not going to abrogate that responsibility. I don't want to understate the importance of your input and that is why we are having this long series of meetings. We can't do everything we want to. NEPA dictates (by Congress) to provide the process by which we proceed. Congress wanted things not be done in a vacuum. If there is a great deal of public concern, then the process is longer.

This is a national park and is for all Americans and not just for the Notch Neighborhood to decide. If we didn't have developers building more houses, we wouldn't have this concern.

Assistant Field Manager for Tucson BLM office: we are listening – I am hearing you very strongly. I hope we are getting closer to answering your questions. We are disagreeing, but we are being very honest and we are having a very good conversation. Even though we weren't talking about design criteria, the comments you were making tonight are very important parts of that issue and you have given us very good information that Bob Lineback wrote down. Other comments have been given personally. Alternate locations have to be considered. We are getting closer to the honest dialogue. You have said you don't want more people attracted to the area, more crime, etc. Then RP said in that way you may want not to limit your designs and comments so you can get the very best and see what will work for us.

I want to respond to the statement that the park is a national park and is for everybody. I try very hard to make this a quality process and these questions are to ask the correct questions so that we get the result that will do what we want it to do. It is awfully easy to say that we are making these comments only for self-interest because we do care very much for the park. I don't apologize about being concerned about the quality of the area – the city would be much nicer if everyone cared for the quality of their areas.

We are not trying to say we resent the public using the park. We have lived there 30 years and have enjoyed the quiet. We would like to say to have what you folks want (not in our neighborhood) but in the park where it belongs. We are fearful of the building up, and we would like to have the increase further south where it might be better. We don't want to restrict hiking and riding.

CB – how would you like to structure the next meeting?

Answer the questions.

I'd like to see some proposals.

CB – there are 14 proposals in front of you.

Not done by landscape architects.

Yes, some of them are.

Can you be sure that you own the land before you proceed?

JB – we will do the best that we can.

Check the land status.

JB - Some of the answers to the questions were provided in the EA. We realize that the EA needs to be revised. We will do the best that we can but we may say that we have to wait for the draft EA to give you answers to some of the questions.

Most of her questions can't be answered because they are opinions – we are never going to achieve that in this group. Let's look at the designs – can we at least cut them down so that the architect has something to work with?

We keep talking about sites. If the EA is to be revised doesn't it say the Broadway site is chosen?

CB – no, it is an EA for several sites. Let's review the good ideas we already have and use that criteria to see what agreement we have. There are 2 proposals – get answers to questions and take a look at designs and get some parameters about the design criteria (what will we have in the design not what it looks like).

How about the last one first? 60 minutes?

And, 60 minutes to answer questions.

Any objections?

Explain one more time what design criteria are. What would it take to solve the problem and address both?
We have waited for 3 meetings to work on this.

Will there be experts? Like who? Is there a template for what we should look at?

RP – there are people here who can guide this (e.g., equestrians). We can try to insert some of these people as we go along.

CB - Can we meet October 24, Wednesday night. 6:30-8:30? Meeting closed.

Comments captured on flip chart during meeting and synopsized:

>Design for horse use

room, space, safety

staging area

>Separate horse and pedestrian parking (pedestrians at the end of Broadway, equestrians on Freeman?)

>Security patrols at end of Broadway

>Place parking totally inside park

>Look at effects of design (bringing more traffic to area)

>Plan parking so it drains

>No parking in neighborhoods